

# SR-169 Corridor Study

## Corridor Working Group Session

### Meeting Summary

---

**Meeting date:** November 16, 2004

**Location:** Lake Wilderness Lodge (22500 SE 248<sup>th</sup> Street, Maple Valley, WA 98038)

**Attendees:** *Partners in attendance:*

Nick Afzali – City of Renton

Dave Zielinski – City of Maple Valley

Jason Paulsen – City of Black Diamond

Chris Searcy – City of Enumclaw

Ann Martin – King County

Allison Dobbins – Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)

Barbara Briggs – Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Northwest Region

Seth Stark – WSDOT, Urban Planning Office

*Partners not in attendance:*

None

*Others in attendance:*

Bill Guenzler – City of Maple Valley

Joan Burlingame – Friends of Rock Creek Valley

Kamuron Gurol – WSDOT

Keith Sabol, Pamela Arora – Parsons Transportation Group

Jon Pascal – The Transpo Group

Kristine dos Remedios – EnviroIssues

**Welcome and Sign SR 169 Charter**

Kamuron Gurol, WSDOT, welcomed the partners and thanked them for taking the time to attend the Corridor Working Group (CWG) session. The SR 169 Charter document was passed around for the partners to sign. Attendees then introduced themselves and shared the name of the organization or jurisdiction they were representing.

**Goals for the Day / Ground Rules**

Kamuron reviewed the session agenda and contents of the packet passed out to the group. Keith Sabol, Parsons, and Jon Pascal, Transpo, would review the study progress to date. Seth Stark, WSDOT, and Pamela Arora, Parsons, would review the immediate, short, and long-term project list with the group. Keith Sabol would then review the Goals and Objectives developed from the SR 169 Corridor Working Group Charter and facilitate a brainstorming session on alternative evaluation criteria and measures.

**Report on Study Progress To Date**

Keith Sabol reviewed the study progress to date. All consultants are now under contract and moving forward with their scopes of work. Comprehensive plans have been collected from each agency and jurisdiction to compile each partner's proposed transportation improvements and land use changes. Background research, including environmental constraints (i.e. hazmat, historical, archeological, and geotechnical), has commenced and will be used in the analysis of study alternatives. Most of the traffic data, including accident history data, has been collected. WSDOT's geographic

information system (GIS) database will be the primary source for mapping aerial photographs and environmental constraints within the project area.

Seth Stark informed the group that the SR 169 Project website would be up and running by the end of the month. The project team will begin to populate the website with project information materials and project status updates as they become finalized. A list of identified stakeholders would also be added to the website and updated as meetings are scheduled and completed. Partners requested that they be informed of and be able to attend any stakeholder interviews within their jurisdictions.

Jon Pascal, from the Transpo Group, then gave a summary of the SR 169 growth in traffic volumes of the corridor study completed to date. The purpose of this summary is to understand existing traffic conditions including volumes and accident history along SR 169. Intersection and corridor traffic will also be analyzed once all traffic data is collected.

Within Renton and parts of Maple Valley, average weekday daily traffic (ADT) volumes were about 40,000 vehicles per day. The increased level of commercial and residential development observed in the Maple Valley area (which has resulted in the high influx of traffic at the SR 169/SR 18 interchange) has contributed to the high volumes in this area. Black Diamond and Enumclaw areas are experiencing ADT levels of about 8,000-10,000 vehicles per day. Overall, there has been over a 50% growth in traffic in both Renton and Maple Valley and no growth has been observed in Enumclaw.

Heavy vehicle percentages were also analyzed. About 14% of the traffic in Enumclaw is due to heavy vehicles. In both Renton and Enumclaw, approximately 10% of the traffic is attributed to heavy vehicles.

There have been three (3) fatalities in the past four (4) years along the corridor, with most of these accidents occurring along the stretch of SR 169 just east of Renton. The project team was told that another fatal accident occurred at the Four-corners intersection in Maple Valley within the last few months and should be added into the analysis. There is one (1) High Accident Location (HAL) and five (5) High Accident Corridor (HAC) segments within the project area.

A copy of the Existing Conditions technical memorandum was distributed to the partners. Further information on existing conditions, including additional traffic data will be available provided to partners at the next CWG meeting. Partners have until December 1<sup>st</sup> to make comments on the technical memorandum. The project team will use the data to ensure that the Route Development Plan addresses current needs along the corridor.

**Review  
Immediate,  
Short, and  
Long-Term  
Project List**

Seth Stark began the SR 169 Draft Immediate, Short, and Long-Term Project list discussion, which was sent out to the partners via email just prior to the meeting. The list is a "snapshot" compilation of each partner's jurisdictional or organizational list for improvements along the SR 169 corridor.

Clarification was given regarding the immediate-, short- and long-term project status designations. Immediate term projects are defined as projects that will be initiated or completed within six to eighteen (6-18) months, have all necessary approvals, and are already funded. Short-term projects are projects that will be initiated or completed in up to six (6) years, may still need funding and/or other approvals. Long-term projects are defined as projects that are typically larger in scope and may take longer than six (6) years to implement. Along with the project status, the project team specified the

importance of each project in terms of improved safety, mobility, and funding status. .

WSDOT then asked the group for feedback to make sure the project designations (immediate, short, and long-term) and descriptions were accurate. WSDOT informed the partners that, per a suggestion made by the SR 164 CWG, a purpose statement and the project status designation definitions would be added at the top of the list, and a map would be developed to show the locations for all of the improvement projects. The list would be considered a working document, and would be updated as more project information was identified.

Partners suggested that the size of the font be increased and the bullets be reformatted to symbols that did not represent negative signs. Partners also requested that a funding column should be added to the immediate, short, and long-term project list to indicate if these projects are not funded, partially funded, or fully funded. If the projects are not funded, the funding still required needs to be reported. Project descriptions on the list should also reflect the local jurisdictions' informational and promotional materials, in order to be consistent with the other agencies.

Partners wanted to clarify if the immediate-, short-, and long-term designations implied any priority to the need for the project. The project team informed the partners that the classifications did not correspond to priority. Projects were sorted in ascending order by mileposts. Project numbers were assigned to each project sequential milepost order. This would be clarified in the purpose statement that will be added to the list. Partners also wanted to know if the model being developed for the corridor study will assume that the immediate-term projects will be completed. Keith Sabol informed the partners that it would.

The partners then offered specific comments regarding projects on the list.

A Pedestrian corridor underpass should be considered at milepost 11.8 between the "legacy site" in Maple Valley and Rock Elementary, which is within the segment of SR 169 under Project 20 (SR 169 from SR 516 to Ravensdale Road). Maple Valley agreed that this was the most important pedestrian corridor along the route, as it connects the highway to the schools, residential areas, libraries and parks, and a separated crossing should be investigated.

Regarding Project 22 (SR 516 from Wax Road to SR 169), partners identified this project as SR 516, not a SR 169 project. It should be removed from the list, even though it is a project that is important to implement.

The lead agency for Project 23 (SR 169 at SR 516 – Four Corners) should be the City of Maple Valley, not the City of Renton. Maple Valley also informed the group that Project 23 will be under construction within 18 months and should be labeled as an immediate-term project.

Project 35 (SR 169 from SE 416<sup>th</sup> Street to north of Enumclaw city limits) was identified as a project that was already implemented, with most improvements completed.

Pieces of the project descriptions for Project 34 (SR 169 at SE 400<sup>th</sup> Road) and 36 (SR 169 at SE 416<sup>th</sup> Street) were the same and partners requested that the project team follow up on the accuracy of these descriptions.

WSDOT and the project team agreed to make corrections and additions to the immediate, short, and long-term project list per comments offered by the partners. [SR 169 does not have a phase I]. Partners have until December 1<sup>st</sup> to offer additional

comments on the list.

#### **Review Draft Goals and Objectives**

Keith Sabol then reviewed the Draft Goals and Objectives established for the corridor basen on the SR 169 Corridor Working Group Charter.

Comments regarding the Goals and Objectives were solicited from the partners. Partners requested that an electronic copy of the documents be sent to them for their review and further comment. Partners also agreed that, in the introduction, the phrase “with minimal environmental impacts” should be reworded. The term “minimal” implies that any project with significant impacts cannot be implemented within the corridor, even with appropriate mitigation. The phrase should be changed to “limiting environmental impacts,” as the partners have every intention of reducing environmental impacts due to improvements along the corridor.

No other comments regarding the Goals and Objectives were made during the meeting. Partners also have until December 1<sup>st</sup> to offer additional comments on the document.

#### **Review Draft Evaluation Criteria**

The next step in the alternatives development process is to identify the evaluation criteria that will be used to ‘rank’ corridor improvement projects. Establishing these criteria will assist the CWG partners in objectively evaluating project alternatives and reaching consensus-based decisions regarding what corridor projects to advance.

Keith Sabol reviewed the Draft Evaluation Criteria with the group. Keith then facilitated a brainstorming session with the partners to identify other criteria or evaluation measures they would add to the draft.

*Enivronmental:* The Environmental criterion was of particular interest to the partners. Partners suggested adding right-of-way availability and groundwater impacts to local water bodies, particularly fish bearing streams, as measures under this criterion. Noise, impacts to the natural environment, environmental justice impacts, and business and community impacts were also added.

*Safety:* Partners agreed to add the measures of reduction in type and severity of correctible accidents, and mitigation within high accident locations and corridors.

*Mobility:* Partners identified access management, vehicle and person delay, provision of multi-modal transportation, and freight mobility as important measures to evaluate corridor alternatives.

The project team agreed to make corrections and additions to the Evaluation Criteria per comments offered by the SR 169 partners, as well as supplement the criteria with comments made by the SR 164 CWG partners that are relevant to the SR 169 corridor. Partners have until December 1<sup>st</sup> to offer additional comments on the document and the evaluation criteria will be discussed further at the December CWG meeting.

#### **Closing and Next Steps**

Partners were interested to know how WSDOT plans to reach out to the general public and how the CWG partners fit into that process. WSDOT informed the partners that they are working to identify stakeholder groups within the project area to interview, solicit comments from, and brief on the project. Public open houses will also be held at various locations along the corridor in order to provide a forum for the general public to hear about the corridor study project and provide comment on the project alternatives.

Partners suggested that WSDOT solicit feedback from the partners regarding local newspapers, newsletters and list serves that are widely read within their jurisdictions in order to distribute project information and inform the public about upcoming participation opportunities. Partners also requested that WSDOT brief their respective councils and electeds, regarding what will be presented at these meetings, before the series of public open houses.

The next CWG meeting will be held the week of December 13<sup>th</sup>. At that meeting, partners will finalize the immediate term project list, goals and objectives, and evaluation criteria.

**Action Items:**

- Partners are to send their availability for the next CWG meeting to Seth Stark at WSDOT ([starks@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:starks@wsdot.wa.gov)) and Kristine dos Remedios at EnviroIssues ([kdosremedios@enviroissues.com](mailto:kdosremedios@enviroissues.com)) by November 19<sup>th</sup>.
- WSDOT will send all documents distributed at the November 16<sup>th</sup> CWG to the partners electronically for their review and comment.
- Partners are to send their comments regarding the Technical Memo from The Transpo Group, SR 169 Improvement Strategies list, SR 169 Goals and Objectives, and SR 169 Evaluation Criteria to Seth Stark at WSDOT ([starks@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:starks@wsdot.wa.gov) 206-464-1288) by December 1<sup>st</sup>
- WSDOT and the project team will revise the above documents per partner comments and send out another draft to the partners one week before the next CWG meeting for review and comment.
- WSDOT will post a PDF of the signed SR 169 Charter on the SR 169 Project Website
- WSDOT will post a list of identified stakeholders on the SR 169 Project Website along with the status of stakeholder interviews
- WSDOT will develop a framework piece regarding how the RDP process informs other regional and state planning documents.
- EnviroIssues will write a meeting summary for the Chartering Session and send it to the partners for review.

**Upcoming Meetings**

- CWG Meeting: The week of December 13<sup>th</sup>

**Handouts**

- CWG Session Agenda
- Final SR 169 Charter
- Final SR 169 Chartering Session Summary
- Draft SR 169 Traffic Volume Analysis Technical Memorandum
- SR 169 Draft Improvement Strategies
- SR 169 Draft Goals and Objectives
- SR 169 Draft Evaluation Criteria
- Draft CWG Participation Schedule